

1
2
3
4 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
5 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**
6

7 JEREMY JOSEPH STROHMEYER,

8 Plaintiff,

9 vs.

10 K. BELANGER et al.,

11 Defendants.
12

3:14-cv-00661-RCJ-WGC

ORDER


13 Plaintiff sued Defendants in this Court *in pro se* for various alleged civil rights violations.
14 Plaintiff has sent a letter to the Court, which the Clerk has entered into the docket as an objection
15 to the Magistrate Judge's recent minute order explaining that under Civil Rule 7, documents
16 requesting action by the Court must be titled motions and that letters to the Court will be
17 disregarded. The Court interprets the present letter not as an objection to the Magistrate Judge's
18 recent minute order but a motion for immediate screening or transfer to another judge.
19 Essentially, Plaintiff is growing impatient with the progress of the case. Plaintiff notes that he
20 has filed the Second Amended Complaint ("SAC"), a motion to screen it, and four additional
21 motions, but that the Court has not yet screened the SAC or ruled on the four motions. The
22 Court will screen the SAC and address the motions in due course. The Court will not prioritize
23 the present case above others and will not transfer it to another judge.
24

1 **CONCLUSION**

2 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Motion for Screening or Transfer (ECF No. 41) and
3 the Motion for Screening (ECF No. 39) are DENIED.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated this *27 DAY OF MARCH, 2018.*

6
7 
8 _____
9 ROBERT C. JONES
10 United States District Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24